

REMARKS

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 1, 2003. Claims 1 to 44 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 17, 37 to 39 and 41 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 39 to 42 were withdrawn from consideration pursuant to a restriction requirement; and Claims 8 to 10, 12 to 14, 24 to 26, 28 to 30, 43 and 44 were withdrawn from consideration pursuant to an election of species requirement. The restriction requirement was traversed in the Response to Restriction Requirement dated January 15, 2003; and the election of species requirement was traversed in the Response to Election of Species Requirement dated May 5, 2003. The Office Action did not reply to the arguments advanced in the traversals, as is required by MPEP § 821.01. Accordingly, the Office is respectfully requested to reply to the arguments advanced by Applicant, or to withdraw the restriction requirement and the election of species requirement entirely.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that Claims 5, 11, 15, 21, 27, 31, 37 and 38 contain allowable subject matter. In keeping with this indication, Claims 37 and 38 have been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Claims 37 and 38 believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 5, 11, 15, 21, 27 and 31 have not been rewritten in independent form, since it is believed that independent Claims 1 and 17 are also in condition for allowance, as detailed more fully below

Claims 1 to 4, 6, 7, 16 to 20, 22, 23 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Japan 11-031816 (Taizo); and Claims 33 to 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) over Taizo. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The present invention as recited by Claim 1 concerns a semiconductor device in which a switching element for allowing a current to flow to a load and a circuit for driving the switching element are formed on a common substrate. The switching element is a first insulated gate transistor which includes: a first semiconductor region of a second conductive type disposed at one main surface of a semiconductor substrate of a first conductive type; a second semiconductor region of the first conductive type disposed within the first semiconductor region; a first gate electrode disposed on a surface in which a pn junction between the second semiconductor region and the first semiconductor region terminates, through an insulating film; a first source region of the second conductive type which is disposed on one end portion side of the first gate electrode within the second semiconductor region; and a first drain region of the second conductive type which is disposed within the first semiconductor region. The circuit for driving the switching element includes a second insulated gate transistor having a characteristic different from that of the first insulated gate transistor.

The present invention as recited by Claim 17 concerns a semiconductor device in which a switching element for allowing a current to flow to a load and a circuit for driving the switching element are formed on a common substrate. The switching element is formed of a DMOS transistor, and the circuit for driving the switching element includes an MOS transistor having a characteristic different from that of the DMOS transistor.

Thus, according to one feature of the invention as recited by Claims 1 and 17, the semiconductor device has a switching element for allowing a current to flow to a load and a

circuit for driving the switching element formed on a common substrate.

Taizo is not seen to teach or suggest at least the foregoing feature.

The Office Action asserts that Taizo's first insulating gate electrode 14A and third insulating gate electrode 14C are equivalent to the switching element and circuit of the present invention. However, nowhere is Taizo seen to disclose that the first insulating gate electrode 14A allows a current to flow to a load. Further, nowhere is Taizo seen to disclose that the third insulating gate electrode 14C drives the first insulating gate electrode 14A.

Applicant therefore concludes that Taizo does not teach or suggest the claimed invention, and it is respectfully requested that the Section 102 and Section 103 rejections be withdrawn.


Should the Examiner decide to maintain the election of species requirement, Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 17 are generic claims. Accordingly, if Claims 1 and 17 are found allowable, prosecution on the merits of the claims directed to the non-elected species is respectfully requested. See MPEP § 806.04(d).

Should the Examiner decide to maintain the restriction requirement, Applicant respectfully requests rejoinder of Claims 39 to 42 pursuant to MPEP § 821.04.

No other matters being raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant
Damond E. Vadnais
Registration No. 52,310

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile No.: (212) 218-2200
DEV:llp

DC_MAIN 148840v1